

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The non-final Office Action of May 23, 2007, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 1-7 remain pending. No claims have been amended. The listing of claims is provided for the Examiner's convenience. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

#### ***Priority***

As requested, a certified translation is provided herewith to eliminate the potential use of intervening reference U.S. 2006/0274899 to Zhu *et al.*

#### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

Applicants submit herewith a (legible) copy of WO 02054201 as requested in the Office Action at page 2.

#### ***Specification***

Applicants have amended the title of the application as suggested by the Office Action at page 2.

#### ***Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

Claims 1, 3, and 5-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0220078 to Luken ("Luken"), in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0016913 to Wheeler *et al.* ("Wheeler"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "generating a new shared key having a specific lifetime by performing signaling communication between said Media Gateway and said Media Gateway Controller with said initial key." The Office Action at page 3 concedes that Luken fails to teach or suggest the recited features. Instead, the Office Action relies on claim 14 of Wheeler to allegedly cure the deficiencies of Luken in this respect. While claim 14 of Wheeler describes that a digital signature is used to generate a session key for secure electronic communications, Wheeler fails to disclose *how* the session key is generated. In particular, nowhere does Wheeler

teach or suggest generating a new shared key having a specific lifetime *by performing signaling communication between said Media Gateway and said Media Gateway Controller with said initial key* as recited in claim 1. Further, there is no teaching or suggestion in Wheeler of performing signaling communication between *a Media Gateway* and *a Media Gateway Controller*. At most, Wheeler discloses a method for generating a digital signature within a computer chip. Generating a digital signature does not constitute authentication between a media gateway and a media gateway controller. Thus, notwithstanding whether a combination of Luken and Wheeler is proper, the resultant combination fails to result in at least the above noted features recited in claim 1. Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the applied references for at least the foregoing reasons.

Moreover, independent claim 1 recites features related to updating a shared key between a Media Gateway and a Media Gateway Controller if the lifetime of the shared key is expired. The Office Action at page 3 correctly indicates that Luken fails to teach or suggest the above noted features. To cure this deficiency of Luken, the Office has taken official notice that updating (or renewing) a key upon its expiration would have required only routine skill in the art. Applicants respectfully request the Office provide documented support for such an assertion in the next communication. Absent the requested support, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable due to the recitation of these additional features.

Dependent claims 3 and 5-7, which each depend from claim 1, are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims, and further in view of the additional novel and non-obvious features recited therein.

Claims 2 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Luken, in view of Wheeler, and further in view of Cryptography and Network Security by William Stallings ("Stallings"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Notwithstanding whether any combination of Luken, Wheeler, and Stallings is proper, Stallings fails to cure the above noted deficiencies of Luken and Wheeler with respect to claim 1. Thus, any proposed combination of the applied references fails to result in the features as recited in independent claim 1. Claims 2 and 4, which depend from claim 1, are allowable for at least

Application. No.: 10/566,206  
Amendment dated August 23, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of May 23, 2007

the same reasons as claim 1, and further in view of the additional advantageous features recited therein.

### **CONCLUSION**

All rejections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same. However, if for any reason the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance or there are any questions, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (202) 824-3156.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: August 23, 2007

By:           /Chunhsi Andy Mu/          

Chunhsi Andy Mu  
Registration No. 58,216

1100 13<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Suite 1200  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Tel: (202) 824-3000  
Fax: (202) 824-3001